arXiv:0904.0390v1 [math.AP] 2 Apr 2009

Long-time Behavior for Nonlinear Hydrodynamic System Modeling the Nematic Liquid Crystal Flows

Hao Wu
School of Mathematical Sciences, Fudan University
Shanghai 200433, China
haowufd@yahoo.com

April 2, 2009

Abstract

We study a simplified system of the original Ericksen-Leslie equations for the flow of nematic liquid crystals. This is a coupled non-parabolic dissipative dynamic system. We show the convergence of global classical solutions to single steady states as time goes to infinity (uniqueness of asymptotic limit) by using the Łojasiewicz–Simon approach. Moreover, we provide an estimate on the convergence rate. Finally, we discuss some possible extensions of the results to certain generalized problems with changing density or free-slip boundary condition.

Keywords: Nematic liquid crystal flow, Navier–Stokes Equations, uniqueness of asymptotic limit, Łojasiewicz-Simon inequality.

AMS Subject Classification: 35B40, 35B41, 35Q35, 76D05.

1 Introduction

We consider the following hydrodynamical model for the flow of nematic liquid crystals (cf. [13, 15])

$$v_t + v\cdot\nabla v - \nu\Delta v + \nabla P = -\lambda\nabla\cdot(\nabla d\odot\nabla d), \tag{1.1}$$

$$\nabla\cdot v = 0, \tag{1.2}$$

$$d_t + v\cdot\nabla d = \gamma(\Delta d - f(d)), \tag{1.3}$$

in $\Omega\times\mathbb{R}^+$, where $\Omega\subset\mathbb{R}^n$ $(n=2,3)$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary Γ. Here, v is the velocity field of the flow and d represents the averaged macroscopic/continuum

molecular orientations in $\mathbb{R}^n$ $(n = 2, 3)$. $P(x,t)$ is a scalar function representing the pressure (including both the hydrostatic and the induced elastic part from the orientation field). The positive constants ν, λ and γ stand for viscosity, the competition between kinetic energy and potential energy, and macroscopic elastic relaxation time (Debroah number) for the molecular orientation field. We assume that $f(d) = \nabla F(d)$ for some smooth bounded function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. $\nabla d \odot \nabla d$ denotes the $n \times n$ matrix whose (i,j)-th entry is given by $\nabla_i d \cdot \nabla_j d$, for $1 \le i, j \le n$.

In this paper we deal with the system (1.1)–(1.3) subject to the initial conditions

$$v|_{t=0} = v_0(x) \ \text{ with } \nabla \cdot v_0 = 0, \quad d|_{t=0} = d_0(x), \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \tag{1.4}$$

and the Dirichlet boundary conditions:

$$v(x,t) = 0, \quad d(x,t) = d_0(x), \qquad \text{for } (x,t) \in \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}^+. \tag{1.5}$$

In [13], the author proposed equations (1.1)–(1.3) as a simplified system of the original Ericksen–Leslie system (cf. [2, 12]). By Ericksen–Leslie's hydrodynamical theory of the liquid crystal, the (simplified) system describing the orientation as well as the macroscopic motion reads as follows (here we assume the density to be constant)

$$\begin{aligned} v_t + v \cdot \nabla v - \nu \Delta v + \nabla P &= -\lambda \nabla \cdot (\nabla d \odot \nabla d), && (1.6)\\ \nabla \cdot v &= 0, && (1.7)\\ d_t + v \cdot \nabla d &= \gamma(\Delta d + |\nabla d|^2 d), \quad |d| = 1. && (1.8) \end{aligned}$$

In order to avoid the gradient nonlinearly in (1.8), usually one uses the Ginzburg–Landau approximation to relax the constraint $|d| = 1$. The corresponding approximate energy is

$$\int_\Omega \frac{1}{2}|\nabla d|^2 + \frac{1}{4\eta^2}(|d|^2 - 1)^2 dx,$$

where η is a positive constant. Then we arrive at the approximation system (1.1)–(1.3), where

$$f(d) = \frac{1}{\eta^2}(|d|^2 - 1)d \tag{1.9}$$

with its antiderivative

$$F(d) = \frac{1}{4\eta^2}(|d|^2 - 1)^2. \tag{1.10}$$

The Ericksen–Leslie system is well suited for describing many special flows for the materials, especially for those with small molecules, and is wildly accepted in the engineering and mathematical communities studying liquid crystals. System (1.1)–(1.3) can be possibly viewed as the simplest mathematical model, which keeps the most important mathematical structure as well as most of the essential difficulties of the original

Ericksen–Leslie system (cf. [15]). System (1.1)–(1.3) with Dirichlet boundary conditions has been studied in a series of work not only theoretically (cf. [15, 16]) but also numerically (cf. [17, 19]). In particular, in [15], the authors proved the existence theorem for the weak solutions of system (1.1)–(1.5) by a modified Galerkin scheme. After that they also obtained the global existence and uniqueness of classical solutions to the same system for $n = 2$ or $n = 3$ with large viscosity assumption. Moreover, a preliminary analysis of the asymptotic behavior of global classical solution was also given in [15]. In the final remark of [15], a natural question on the uniqueness of the asymptotic limit was raised. This is just the main goal of the present paper. For the sake of simplicity, in the following text, we always treat the nonlinearity f of form (1.9). However, it is not difficult to verify that our results holds true for more general nonlinearities which is analytic and with proper growth and dissipation assumptions.

In this paper, we show the convergence to equilibrium of global classical solutions to system (1.1)–(1.5). Namely, we obtain the following results:

Theorem 1.1. *When $n = 2$, for any $v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $\nabla \cdot v_0 = 0$ and $d_0 \in H^2(\Omega)$, the unique classical solution to problem (1.1)–(1.5) has the following property*

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} (\|v(t)\|_{H^1} + \|d(t) - d_\infty\|_{H^2}) = 0, \tag{1.11}$$

where d_∞ is a solution to the following nonlinear elliptic boundary value problem:

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta d_\infty + f(d_\infty) = 0, & x \in \Omega, \\ d_\infty = d_0(x), & x \in \Gamma. \end{cases} \tag{1.12}$$

Moreover, there exists a positive constant C depending on $v_0, d_0, \Omega, d_\infty$, such that

$$\|v(t)\|_{H^1} + \|d(t) - d_\infty\|_{H^2} \le C(1+t)^{-\frac{\theta}{(1-2\theta)}}, \quad \forall\, t \ge 0, \tag{1.13}$$

with $\theta \in (0, 1/2)$ being the same constant as in the Łojasiewicz–Simon inequality (see Lemma 2.1 below).

When the spacial dimension is three, we deal with two cases. The first result is concerning the large viscosity case, we have

Theorem 1.2. *When $n = 3$, for any $v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega)$ with $\nabla \cdot v_0 = 0$, $d_0 \in H^2(\Omega)$ under the large viscosity assumption $\nu \ge \nu_0(\lambda, \gamma, v_0, d_0)$, the unique global classical solution of problem (1.1)–(1.5) enjoys the same properties as in Theorem 1.1.*

The second one is a "stability" result for the near equilibrium initial data in the three dimensional case.

Theorem 1.3. *When $n = 3$, let $d^* \in H^2(\Omega)$ be an absolute minimizer of the functional*

$$E(d) = \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla d\|^2 + \int_\Omega F(d)dx$$

in the sense that $E(d^*) \le E(d)$ whenever $d = d^* = d_0(x)$ on Γ. There is a constant σ which may depend on λ, γ, ν and v_0, d_0, such that if $\|v_0\|_{H^1} + \|d_0 - d^*\|_{H^2} < \sigma$, then the problem (1.1)–(1.5) admits a unique global classical solution enjoying the same properties as in Theorem 1.1.

Remark 1.1. *Theorem 1.3 implies that if the initial data is sufficiently close to an absolute minimizer of functional E, then there exists a global solution and the solution will converge to an equilibrium which may not necessarily be the original minimizer. This is because the set of equilibria might be a continuum. Theorem 1.3 gives the "uniqueness" of asymptotic limit of the global solution to problem (1.1)–(1.5). This improves the result stated in [15, Theorem C], in which only sequence convergence for director field d was obtained.*

The problem about uniqueness of asymptotic limit for nonlinear evolution equations, namely whether the global solution will converge to an equilibrium as time tends to infinity, has attracted a lot of interests of mathematicians. If the space dimension $n \ge 2$, it is known that the structure of the set of equilibria can be nontrivial and may form a continuum for certain physically reasonable nonlinearities. The reader is referred, for instance, to [7, Rem. 2.3.13], where the following two-dimensional equation $-\Delta u + u^3 - \lambda u = 0$, $\lambda > 0$, endowed with a standard Dirichlet homogeneous boundary condition, is considered. And we note that, for the vector functions, the situations may be even more complicated. If this is the case, it is highly nontrivial to decide whether or not a given bounded trajectory converges to a single steady state. In 1983, L. Simon [23] made a breakthrough that for a semilinear parabolic equation with a nonlinearity $f(x, u)$ being analytic in the unknown function u, its bounded global solution would converge to an equilibrium as $t \to \infty$. Simon's idea relies on a generalization of the Łojasiewicz inequality (see [21,22]) for analytic functions defined in finite dimensional space $\mathbb{R}^m$. Since then, his original approach has been simplified and applied to prove convergence results for many evolution equations (see e.g., [4–6,8–11,14,27–29] and the references cited therein). For our problem (1.1)–(1.5), in order to apply the Łojasiewicz–Simon approach to prove the convergence result, we need to introduce a suitable Łojasiewicz–Simon type inequality for vector functions with nonhomogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition (cf. Lemma 2.1).

As far as the convergence rate is concerned, it is known that an estimate in certain (lower order) norm can usually be obtained directly from the Łojasiewicz–Simon approach

(see, e.g., [9,30]). Then, one straightforward way to get estimates in higher order norms is using interpolation inequalities (cf. [9]) and, consequently, the decay exponent deteriorates. We shall show that by using suitable energy estimates and constructing proper differential inequalities, it is possible to obtain the same estimates on convergence rate in both higher and lower order norms. Our approach in some sense improves the previous results in the literature (see, for instance, [9,30]) and it can apply to many other problems (cf. [5,6,28,29]).

The remaining part of this paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the functional setting, some preliminary results as well as some technical lemmas. Section 3 is devoted to the two dimensional case. We prove the convergence of global solutions to single steady states as time goes to infinity and obtain an estimate on convergence rate. In Section 4, we consider the three dimensional case. The same convergence result was proved for two subcases, in which the global existence of classical solutions can be obtained. In the final Section 5, we discuss some possible extensions of our results to certain generalized problems with changing density or free-slip boundary conditions.

2 Preliminaries

First, we introduce the function spaces we shall work on (cf. [15,26]):

$$
\begin{aligned}
&H_0^1(\Omega) = \text{the closure of } C_0^\infty(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ in the norm } \left(\int_\Omega |\nabla v|^2 dx\right)^{\frac{1}{2}},\\
&H^{-1}(\Omega) = \text{the dual of } H_0^1(\Omega),\\
&H^2(\Omega) = \{v \in L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n) \mid v_{x_i}, v_{x_ix_j} \in L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n),\ 1 \le i,j \le n\},\\
&\mathcal{V} = C_0^\infty(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n) \cap \{v : \nabla \cdot v = 0\},\\
&H = \text{ the closure of } \mathcal{V} \text{ in } L^2(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^n),\\
&V = \text{ the closure of } \mathcal{V} \text{ in } H_0^1(\Omega),\\
&V' = \text{the dual of } V.
\end{aligned}
$$

Global existence and uniqueness of classical solution to system (1.1)–(1.5) has been proven in [15, Theorem B]. More precisely, we have

Proposition 2.1. *Problem* (1.1)–(1.5) *admits a unique global classical solution* (v,d) *provided that* $v_0 \in H_0^1(\Omega), d_0 \in H^2(\Omega)$ *either* $n=2$ *or* $n=3$ *with the large viscosity assumption* $\nu \ge \nu_0(\lambda,\gamma,v_0,d_0)$.

For any classical solution $(v,d) \in \Omega \times [0,T] = Q_T$ $(0 \le T \le +\infty)$ of problem (1.1)–

(1.5), we consider the functional

$$\mathcal{E}(t) = \frac{1}{2}\|v(t)\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\|\nabla d(t)\|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2}\int_\Omega F(d(t))dx. \tag{2.1}$$

It has been shown in [15] that our system (1.1)–(1.5) has the following *basic energy law*, which can be viewed as a direct consequence of the balance laws of the linear momentum (1.1) and angular momentum (1.3):

$$\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(t) + \nu\|\nabla v(t)\|^2 + \lambda\gamma\|\Delta d(t) - f(d(t))\|^2 = 0, \quad 0 \le t \le T. \tag{2.2}$$

(2.2) reflects the energy dissipation property of the flow of liquid crystals. Moreover, one can verify that $\mathcal{E}(t)$ serves as a Lyapunov functional for problem (1.1)–(1.5).

Next, we look at the following elliptic boundary value problem

$$\begin{cases} -\Delta d + f(d) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \\ d = d_0(x), \quad x \in \Gamma. \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

Denote

$$E(d) = \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla d\|^2 + \int_\Omega F(d)dx. \tag{2.4}$$

It is not difficult to see that the solution to (2.3) is a critical point of $E(d)$, and conversely, the critical point of $E(d)$ is a solution to (2.3) (cf. [27, 29] and references cited therein). Besides, regularity of the solution to (2.3) has been shown in [15] such that d is smooth on Ω provided d_0 is smooth on Γ.

As mentioned in Introduction, in order to apply the Łojasiewicz–Simon approach to prove the convergence to equilibrium, we have to introduce a suitable Łojasiewicz–Simon type inequality related to our present problem. In particular, we have

Lemma 2.1. [Łojasiewicz–Simon Type Inequality] *Let ψ be a critical point of $E(d)$. There exist constants $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\beta > 0$ depending on ψ such that for any $d \in H^1(\Omega)$ satisfying $d|_\Gamma = d_0(x)$ and $\|d - \psi\|_{H^1} < \beta$, there holds*

$$\| - \Delta d + f(d)\|_{H^{-1}} \ge |E(d) - E(\psi)|^{1-\theta}. \tag{2.5}$$

Remark 2.1. *The above lemma can be viewed as an extended version of Simon's result [23] for scalar function under the use of L^2-norm. We can refer to [10, Chapter 2, Theorem 5.2], in which the case for vectors subject to homogeneous Dirichlet boundary condition was considered. Here we observe that, our present (nontrivial) boundary data for director field d does not depend on time. As a result, every solution to the corresponding stationary problem (2.3), which is a critical point of $E(d)$ satisfies the same boundary condition as the solution to the evolution problem. Therefore, we only have to derive a Łojasiewicz–Simon*

type inequality for functions d, which satisfy $d|_\Gamma = d_0(x)$ and fall into a properly small neighborhood of certain but arbitrary critical point of $E(d)$. In this case, it is always true that the difference $\tilde{d} = d - \psi \in H_0^1(\Omega)$. Keeping this fact in mind, we are able to prove the present lemma following the steps in [10, Chapter 2, Theorem 5.2] or [8]. Hence, the details are omitted here. We could also refer to a related case treated in [5], that a nonhomogeneous (time-dependent Dirichlet) boundary condition was removed by a proper variable transformation (cf. also [27] where the boundary condition contains a nonzero constant).

In the following text, we will use the regularity result for Stokes problem (cf. [25])

Lemma 2.2. *Denote the Stokes operator by S, which is a unbounded operator in H of domain $H^2(\Omega) \cap V$:*

$$Su = -\Delta u + \nabla \pi \in \ H, \quad \forall u \in H^2(\Omega) \cap V.$$

Then there exists a constant C such that for any $u \in H^2(\Omega) \cap V$,

$$\|u\|_{H^2} + \|\pi\|_{H^1 \setminus \mathbb{R}} \leq C \|Su\|.$$

Before ending this section, we introduce the following lemma which is useful in the study of large time behavior of solutions to evolution problems. We will apply it to obtain uniform (higher order) estimates of the solution and decay of the energy dissipations of system (1.1)–(1.5).

Lemma 2.3. [30, Lemma 6.2.1] *Let T be given with $0 < T \leq +\infty$. Suppose that $y(t)$ and $h(t)$ are nonnegative continuous functions defined on $[0, T]$ and satisfy the following conditions:*

$$\frac{dy}{dt} \leq c_1 y^2 + c_2 + h(t), \quad \textit{with} \quad \int_0^T y(t)dt \leq c_3, \quad \int_0^T h(t)dt \leq c_4,$$

where $c_i (i = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ are given nonnegative constants. Then for any $r \in (0, T)$, the following estimates holds:

$$y(t + r) \leq \left(\frac{c_3}{r} + c_2 r + c_4 \right) e^{c_1 c_3}, \quad \forall\ t \in [0, T - r].$$

Furthermore, if $T = +\infty$, then

$$\lim_{t \to +\infty} y(t) = 0.$$

3 Convergence to Equilibrium for Two Dimensional Case

In this section, we prove the convergence of global solutions to single steady states as time tends to infinity for 2-D case. Since parameters λ, γ, ν do not play crucial role in the 2-D case, we set $\lambda = \gamma = \nu = 1$ in this section for the sake of simplicity.

When the space dimension equals to two, an important property for the global solution to problem (1.1)–(1.5) is the following high order energy law, which played a crucial role in the proof of global existence result in [15]. Denote

$$A(t) = \|\nabla v(t)\|^2 + \|\Delta d(t) - f(d(t))\|^2. \tag{3.1}$$

Then we have

Lemma 3.1. *(cf. [15, (4.9)]) In 2-D case, the following inequality holds for the classical solution (v, d) to problem (1.1)–(1.5)*

$$\frac{d}{dt}A(t) + (\|\Delta v\|^2 + \|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2) \leq C(A^2(t) + A(t)), \quad \forall\ t \geq 0, \tag{3.2}$$

where C is a constant depending on $f, \Omega, \|v_0\|, \|d_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$.

3.1 Convergence to Equilibrium

Based on the high order energy law (3.2), we are able to show the convergence of the velocity field v first.

Lemma 3.2. *For any $t \geq 0$, the following uniform estimate holds*

$$\|v(t)\|_{H^1} + \|d(t)\|_{H^2} \leq C, \tag{3.3}$$

where C is a constant depending on $f, \Omega, \|v_0\|_{H^1}, \|d_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$. Furthermore,

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}(\|v(t)\|_{H^1} + \| - \Delta d(t) + f(d(t))\|) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Proof. It follows from the basic energy law (2.1) that

$$\mathcal{E}(t) + \int_0^t A(\tau)d\tau = \mathcal{E}(0) < \infty, \quad \forall\ t \geq 0. \tag{3.5}$$

By the Young inequality $a^2 \leq \frac{1}{2}a^4 + \frac{1}{2}$, we can see that $\mathcal{E}(t)$ is bounded from below by a constant which is only dependent of $|\Omega|$. As a result,

$$\int_0^\infty A(t)dt \leq \mathcal{E}(0) < +\infty, \tag{3.6}$$

and

$$\mathcal{E}(t) \leq \mathcal{E}(0), \quad \forall\, t \geq 0. \tag{3.7}$$

(3.7) implies the uniform estimate

$$\|v(t)\| + \|d(t)\|_{H^1} \leq C, \quad \forall\, t \geq 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Furthermore, (3.6) together with Lemma 3.1 and Lemma 2.3 yields that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} (\|\nabla v(t)\| + \|\Delta d(t) - f(d(t))\|) = 0. \tag{3.9}$$

By the Poincaré inequality, we prove the conclusion (3.4). Concerning the uniform bound (3.3), we take $r = 1$ in Lemma 2.3 to get

$$\|\nabla v(t)\| + \| - \Delta d(t) + f(d(t))\| \leq C, \quad \forall\, t \geq 1, \tag{3.10}$$

where C does not depend on t. On the other hand, for any $t \in [0, 1]$, it follows from (3.2) and the fact $\int_0^1 A(t)dt \leq C$ that

$$\sup_{0\leq t\leq 1} A(t) \leq e^{\int_0^1 A(t)dt} A(0) + C \leq C. \tag{3.11}$$

Besides, from the continuous embedding $H^1 \hookrightarrow L^p (1 \leq p < \infty)$ and (3.8) we have

$$\|\Delta d\| \leq \| - \Delta d + f(d)\| + \|f(d)\| \leq \| - \Delta d + f(d)\| + C\left(1 + \|d\|_{L^6}^3\right) \leq C. \tag{3.12}$$

Now we can conclude (3.3) from (3.10)–(3.12). The proof is complete. □

Let $\mathcal{S}$ be the set

$$\mathcal{S} = \{(0, u) \mid \ -\Delta u + f(u) = 0, \text{ in } \Omega, \ u|_\Gamma = d_0(x)\}.$$

The ω-limit set of $(v_0, d_0) \in V \times H^2(\Omega) \subset L^2(\Omega) \times H^1(\Omega)$ is defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \omega((v_0, d_0)) \ = \ & \{(v_\infty(x), d_\infty(x)) \mid \text{ there exists } \{t_n\} \nearrow \infty \text{ such that} \\ & (v(x, t_n), d(x, t_n)) \to (v_\infty(x), d_\infty(x)) \text{ in } L^2 \times H^1, \text{ as } t_n \to +\infty\}. \end{aligned}$$

We infer from Lemma 3.2 that

Proposition 3.1. *$\omega((v_0, d_0))$ is a nonempty bounded subset in $H^1(\Omega) \times H^2(\Omega)$. Besides, all asymptotic limiting points (v_∞, d_∞) of problem (1.1)–(1.5) belong to $\mathcal{S}$. In other words, $\omega((v_0, d_0)) \subset \mathcal{S}$.*

In what follows, we prove the convergence for director field d. For any initial datum $(v_0, d_0) \in V \times H^2(\Omega)$, it follows from Lemma 3.2 that $\|d\|_{H^2}$ is uniformly bounded. Since the embedding $H^2 \hookrightarrow H^1$ is compact, there is an increasing unbounded sequence $\{t_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and a function d_∞ such that

$$\lim_{t_n\to+\infty} \|d(t_n) - d_\infty\|_{H^1} = 0. \tag{3.13}$$

In particular, Proposition 3.1 implies that d_∞ satisfies the equation

$$-\Delta d_\infty + f(d_\infty) = 0, \quad x \in \Omega, \quad d_\infty|_\Gamma = d_0. \tag{3.14}$$

We prove the convergence result following a simple argument introduced in [11], in which the key observation is that after a certain time t_0, $d(t)$ will fall into a certain small neighborhood of d_∞ and stay there forever.

From the basic energy law (2.1), we can see that $\mathcal{E}(t)$ is decreasing on $[0, \infty)$, and it has a finite limit as time goes to infinity because it is bounded from below. Therefore, it follows from (3.13) that

$$\lim_{t_n\to+\infty} \mathcal{E}(t_n) = E(d_\infty). \tag{3.15}$$

On the other hand, we can infer from (2.1) that $\mathcal{E}(t) \geq E(d_\infty)$, for all $t > 0$, and the equal sign holds if and only if, for all $t > 0$, $v = 0$ and d solves problem (3.14).

We now consider all possibilities.

Case 1. If there is a $t_0 > 0$ such that at this time $\mathcal{E}(t_0) = E(d_\infty)$, then for all $t > t_0$, we deduce from (2.1) that

$$\|\nabla v\| \equiv 0, \quad \|-\Delta d + f(d)\| \equiv 0. \tag{3.16}$$

It follows from (1.3), (3.16) and the Sobolev embedding Theorem that for $t > t_0$

$$0 \leq \|d_t\| \leq \|v \cdot \nabla d\| + \|-\Delta d + f(d)\| \leq \|v\|_{L^4}\|\nabla d\|_{L^4} \leq C\|\nabla v\| = 0. \tag{3.17}$$

Namely, d is independent of time for all $t > t_0$. Due to (3.13), we have $d(t) \equiv d_\infty$ for $t > t_0$.

Case 2. For all $t > 0$, $\mathcal{E}(t) > E(d_\infty)$. First we assume that the following claim holds true.

Proposition 3.2. *There is a $t_0 > 0$ that for all $t \geq t_0$, $\|d(t) - d_\infty\|_{H^1} < \beta$. Namely, for all $t \geq t_0$, $d(t)$ satisfies the condition in Lemma 2.1.*

In this case, it follows from Lemma 2.1 that

$$|E(d) - E(d_\infty)|^{1-\theta} \leq \|-\Delta d + f(d)\|_{H^{-1}} \leq \|-\Delta d + f(d)\|, \quad \forall\, t \geq t_0. \tag{3.18}$$

The fact $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ implies $0 < 1-\theta < 1$, $2(1-\theta) > 1$. As a consequence,

$$\|v\|^{2(1-\theta)} = \|v\|^{2(1-\theta)-1}\|v\| \leq C\|v\|.$$

Then we infer from the basic inequality

$$(a+b)^{1-\theta} \leq a^{1-\theta} + b^{1-\theta}, \qquad \forall\ a, b \geq 0$$

that

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathcal{E}(t) - E(d_\infty))^{1-\theta} &\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2 + |E(d) - E(d_\infty)|\right)^{1-\theta} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2 + \|-\Delta d + f(d)\|^{\frac{1}{1-\theta}}\right)^{1-\theta} \\
&\leq \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1-\theta} \|v\|^{2(1-\theta)} + \|-\Delta d + f(d)\| \\
&\leq C\|v\| + \|-\Delta d + f(d)\|. \qquad (3.19)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, a direct calculation yields

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{d}{dt}(\mathcal{E}(t) - E(d_\infty))^{\theta} &= -\theta(\mathcal{E}(t) - E(d_\infty))^{\theta-1}\frac{d}{dt}\mathcal{E}(t) \\
&\geq \frac{C\theta(\|\nabla v\| + \|-\Delta d + f(d)\|)^2}{C\|v\| + \|-\Delta d + f(d)\|} \\
&\geq C_1(\|\nabla v\| + \|-\Delta d + f(d)\|), \quad \forall\ t \geq t_0, \qquad (3.20)
\end{aligned}$$

where C_1 is a constant depending on v_0, d_0, Ω.
Integrating from t_0 to t, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&(\mathcal{E}(t) - E(d_\infty))^{\theta} + C_1 \int_{t_0}^{t} (\|\nabla v(\tau)\| + \|-\Delta d(\tau) + f(d(\tau))\|)d\tau \\
\leq\ & (\mathcal{E}(t_0) - E(d_\infty))^{\theta} < \infty, \quad \forall\ t \geq t_0. \qquad (3.21)
\end{aligned}$$

Since $\mathcal{E}(t) - E(d_\infty) \geq 0$, we conclude that

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} (\|\nabla v(\tau)\| + \|-\Delta d(\tau) + f(d(\tau))\|)d\tau < \infty. \qquad (3.22)$$

On the other hand, it follows from equation (1.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\|d_t\| &\leq \|v \cdot \nabla d\| + \|-\Delta d + f(d) \leq \|v\|_{L^4}\|\nabla d\|_{L^4} + \|-\Delta d + f(d)\| \\
&\leq C\|\nabla v\| + \|-\Delta d + f(d)\|. \qquad (3.23)
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\int_{t_0}^{\infty} \|d_t(\tau)\|d\tau < +\infty, \qquad (3.24)$$

which easily implies that as $t \to +\infty$, $d(x,t)$ converges in $L^2(\Omega)$. This and (3.13) indicate that

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|d(t) - d_\infty\| = 0. \tag{3.25}$$

Since $d(t)$ is uniformly bounded in $H^2(\Omega)$ (cf. (3.3)), by interpolation we have

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|d(t) - d_\infty\|_{H^1} = 0. \tag{3.26}$$

On the other hand, uniform bound of d in $H^2(\Omega)$ implies the weak convergence

$$d(t) \rightharpoonup d_\infty, \quad \text{in } H^2(\Omega).$$

However, the decay property of the quantity $A(t)$ (cf. Lemma 3.2) could tell us more. Namely, we could get strong convergence of d in H^2 without using uniform estimates in higher order norm. To see this, we keep in mind that that

$$\begin{aligned} \|\Delta d - \Delta d_\infty\| &\le \|\Delta d - \Delta d_\infty - f(d) + f(d_\infty)\| + \|f(d) - f(d_\infty)\| \\ &\le \|\Delta d - f(d)\| + \|f'(\xi)\|_{L^4}\|d - d_\infty\|_{L^4} \\ &\le \|\Delta d - f(d)\| + C\|d - d_\infty\|_{H^1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

The above estimate together with (3.4) and (3.26) yields

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty} \|d(t) - d_\infty\|_{H^2} = 0. \tag{3.28}$$

To finish the proof, we will show that Proposition 3.2 always holds true for the global solution $d(t)$ to system (1.1)–(1.5). Define

$$\bar{t}_n = \sup\{\ t > t_n |\ \|d(\cdot, s) - d_\infty\|_{H^1} < \beta,\ \forall\ s \in [t_n, t]\}. \tag{3.29}$$

It follows from (3.13) that for any $\varepsilon \in (0, \beta)$, there exists an integer N such that when $n \ge N$,

$$\|d(\cdot, t_n) - d_\infty\|_{H^1} < \varepsilon, \tag{3.30}$$

$$\frac{1}{C_1}(\mathcal{E}(t_n) - E(d_\infty))^\theta < \varepsilon. \tag{3.31}$$

On the other hand, we can easily see that the orbit of d is continuous in H^1. This is because we already know from (3.3) that $d \in L^\infty(0, +\infty; H^2(\Omega))$. As a consequence, $d \in L^2(t, t+1; H^2(\Omega))$ for any $t \ge 0$. The basic energy law and (3.23) imply $d_t \in L^2(t, t+1; L^2(\Omega))$. Thus, $d \in C([t, t+1]; H^1(\Omega))$, for any $t \ge 0$ (cf. [3]). The continuity of the orbit of d in H^1 and (3.30) yield that

$$\bar{t}_n > t_n, \quad \text{for all } \ n \ge N.$$

Then there are two possibilities:

(i). If there exists $n_0 \geq N$ such that $\bar{t}_{n_0} = +\infty$, then from the previous discussions in Case 1 and Case 2, the theorem is proved.

(ii). Otherwise, for all $n \geq N$, we have $t_n < \bar{t}_n < +\infty$, and for all $t \in [t_n, \bar{t}_n]$, $E(d_\infty) < \mathcal{E}(t)$. Then from (3.21) with t_0 being replaced by t_n, and t being replaced by $\bar{t}_n$, we get from (3.31) that

$$\int_{t_n}^{\bar{t}_n} (\|\nabla v(\tau)\| + \| - \Delta d(\tau) + f(d(\tau))\|) d\tau < \varepsilon. \tag{3.32}$$

Thus, it follows that (cf. (3.23))

$$\begin{aligned} \|d(\bar{t}_n) - d_\infty\| &\leq \|d(t_n) - d_\infty\| + \int_{t_n}^{\bar{t}_n} \|d_t(\tau)\| d\tau \\ &\leq \|d(t_n) - d_\infty\| + C \int_{t_n}^{\bar{t}_n} (\|\nabla v(\tau)\| + \| - \Delta d(\tau) + f(d(\tau))\|) d\tau \\ &< C\varepsilon, \end{aligned} \tag{3.33}$$

which implies that $\lim_{n \to +\infty} \|d(\bar{t}_n) - d_\infty\| = 0$. Since $d(t)$ is relatively compact in $H^1(\Omega)$, there exists a subsequence of $\{d(\bar{t}_n)\}$, still denoted by $\{d(\bar{t}_n)\}$ converging to d_∞ in $H^1(\Omega)$, i.e., when n is sufficiently large,

$$\|d(\bar{t}_n) - d_\infty\|_{H^1} < \beta$$

which contradicts the definition of $\bar{t}_n$ that $\|d(\cdot, \bar{t}_n) - d_\infty\|_{H^1} = \beta$.

Summing up, we have considered all the possible cases and the conclusion (1.11) is proved.

3.2 Convergence Rate

In this part, we shall show the estimate on convergence rate (1.13). This can be achieved in several steps.

Step 1. As has been shown in the literature (cf. for instance, [9, 30]), an estimate on the convergence rate in certain lower order norm could be obtained directly from the Łojasiewicz–Simon approach. From Lemma 2.1 and (3.20), we have

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\mathcal{E}(t) - E(d_\infty)) + C_1(\mathcal{E}(t) - E(d_\infty))^{2(1-\theta)} \leq 0, \quad \forall\, t \geq t_0, \tag{3.34}$$

which implies

$$\mathcal{E}(t) - E(d_\infty) \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{1}{1-2\theta}} \quad \forall\, t \geq t_0. \tag{3.35}$$

Integrating (3.20) on (t,∞), where $t \geq t_0$, it follows from (3.23) that

$$\int_t^\infty \|d_t\| d\tau \leq \int_t^\infty (C\|\nabla v\| + \| - \Delta f + f(d)\|) d\tau \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{\theta}{1-2\theta}}. \tag{3.36}$$

By adjusting the constant C properly, we obtain

$$\|d(t) - d_\infty\| \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{\theta}{1-2\theta}}, \quad t \geq 0. \tag{3.37}$$

Step 2. In Step 1, we only obtain the convergence rate of d (in L^2). Unlike for the temperature variable in some phase-field systems (cf. [5, 29] and references cited therein), although we have got some decay information for the velocity field v such that

$$\int_t^\infty \|\nabla v\| d\tau \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{\theta}{1-2\theta}}, \tag{3.38}$$

it is not easy to prove convergence rate of v directly. This is because now v satisfies a Navier–Stokes type equation, which is much more complicated than the heat equation for the temperature variable in phase-field systems. As a result, one cannot easily obtain relation between $\|\nabla v\|$ and v_t (in certain possible norm) from the equation itself. However, it is possible to achieve our goal by using the idea in [29], where we use higher order energy estimates and construct proper differential inequalities (cf. also [5, 6, 28]). Besides, in this way the convergence rate of d in higher order norm can be proved simultaneously.

The steady state solution corresponding to problem (1.1)–(1.5) satisfies the following system (cf. [15])

$$\begin{aligned}
v_\infty \cdot \nabla v_\infty - \nu \Delta v_\infty + \nabla P_\infty &= -\nabla \cdot (\nabla d_\infty \odot \nabla d_\infty), && (3.39)\\
\nabla \cdot v_\infty &= 0, && (3.40)\\
v_\infty \cdot \nabla d_\infty &= \Delta d_\infty - f(d_\infty), && (3.41)\\
v_\infty|_\Gamma = 0, \qquad & d_\infty|_\Gamma = d_0(x). && (3.42)
\end{aligned}$$

Lemma 3.2 implies that the limiting point of system (1.1)–(1.5) has the form $(0, d_\infty) \in \mathcal{S}$. As a result, system (3.39)–(3.42) can be reduced to

$$\begin{aligned}
\nabla P_\infty &= -\nabla d_\infty \cdot \Delta d_\infty - \nabla \left(\frac{|\nabla d_\infty|^2}{2} \right), && (3.43)\\
-\Delta d_\infty + f(d_\infty) &= 0, && (3.44)\\
d_\infty|_\Gamma &= d_0(x), && (3.45)
\end{aligned}$$

where in (3.43) we have used the fact that

$$\nabla \cdot (\nabla d_\infty \odot \nabla d_\infty) = \nabla \left(\frac{|\nabla d_\infty|^2}{2} \right) + \nabla d_\infty \cdot \Delta d_\infty.$$

Subtracting the stationary problem (3.43)–(3.45) from the evolution problem (1.1)–(1.5), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & v_t + v\cdot\nabla v - \nu\Delta v + \nabla(P-P_\infty) + \nabla\left(\left(\frac{|\nabla d|^2}{2}\right) - \left(\frac{|\nabla d_\infty|^2}{2}\right)\right) \\ = \;& -\nabla d\cdot\Delta d + \nabla d_\infty\cdot\Delta d_\infty, \qquad (3.46) \\ & \nabla\cdot v = 0, \qquad (3.47) \\ & d_t + v\cdot\nabla d = \Delta(d-d_\infty) - f(d) + f(d_\infty), \qquad (3.48) \\ & (d-d_\infty)|_\Gamma = 0. \qquad (3.49) \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (3.46) by v and (3.48) by $-\Delta d + f(d) = -\Delta(d-d_\infty) + f(d) - f(d_\infty)$ respectively, integrating on Ω, and adding the results together, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla d - \nabla d_\infty\|^2 + \int_\Omega F(d) - F(d_\infty) - f(d_\infty)(d-d_\infty)dx\right) \\ & +\nu\|\nabla v\|^2 + \|\Delta d - f(d)\|^2 \\ = \;& (v, \nabla d_\infty\cdot\Delta d_\infty) \\ = \;& (v, \nabla d_\infty\cdot(\Delta d_\infty - f(d_\infty))) + (v\cdot\nabla d_\infty, -f(d_\infty)) \\ = \;& 0. \qquad (3.50) \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (3.48) by $d-d_\infty$ and integrating in Ω, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\|d-d_\infty\|^2 + \|\nabla(d-d_\infty)\|^2 = -(v\cdot\nabla d, d-d_\infty) - (f(d)-f(d_\infty), d-d_\infty) := I_1. \qquad (3.51)$$

The right hand side can be estimated as follows

$$\begin{aligned} |I_1| &\le \|v\|_{L^4}\|\nabla d\|_{L^4}\|d-d_\infty\| + \|f'(\xi)\|_{L^3}\|d-d_\infty\|_{L^3}^2 \\ &\le C\|\nabla v\|\|d-d_\infty\| + C(\|\nabla(d-d_\infty)\|^{\frac{1}{3}}\|d-d_\infty\|^{\frac{2}{3}} + \|d-d_\infty\|)^2 \\ &\le \varepsilon_1\|\nabla v\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla(d-d_\infty)\|^2 + C\|d-d_\infty\|^2. \qquad (3.52) \end{aligned}$$

Multiplying (3.51) by $\alpha > 0$ and adding the resultant to (3.50), using (3.52) we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{d}{dt}\left(\frac{1}{2}\|v\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla d - \nabla d_\infty\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|d-d_\infty\|^2 + \int_\Omega F(d)dx - \int_\Omega F(d_\infty)dx\right. \\ & \left. - \int_\Omega f(d_\infty)(d-d_\infty)dx\right) + (\nu - \alpha\varepsilon_1)\|\nabla v\|^2 + \|\Delta d - f(d)\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|\nabla(d-d_\infty)\|^2 \\ \le \;& C\alpha\|d-d_\infty\|^2. \qquad (3.53) \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, by the Taylor's expansion, we have

$$F(d) = F(d_\infty) + f(d_\infty)(d-d_\infty) + f'(\xi)(d-d_\infty)^2, \qquad (3.54)$$

where $\xi = ad + (1-a)d_\infty$ with $a \in [0,1]$.
Then we deduce that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \int_\Omega F(d)dx - \int_\Omega F(d_\infty)dx + \int_\Omega f(d_\infty)d_\infty dx - \int_\Omega f(d_\infty)d\, dx \right| \\ = & \left| \int_\Omega f'(\xi)(d-d_\infty)^2 dx \right| \\ \leq & \|f'(\xi)\|_{L^\infty}\|d-d_\infty\|^2 \leq C_2\|d-d_\infty\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.55}$$

Let us define now, for $t \geq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} y(t) = & \frac{1}{2}\|v(t)\|^2 + \frac{1}{2}\|\nabla d(t) - \nabla d_\infty\|^2 + \frac{\alpha}{2}\|d(t)-d_\infty\|^2 + \int_\Omega F(d(t))dx - \int_\Omega F(d_\infty)dx \\ & - \int_\Omega f(d_\infty)(d(t)-d_\infty)dx. \end{aligned} \tag{3.56}$$

In (3.53) and (3.56), we choose

$$\alpha \geq 1 + 2C_2 > 0, \quad \varepsilon_1 = \frac{\nu}{4\alpha}.$$

As a result,

$$y(t) + C_2\|d-d_\infty\|^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\|v\|^2 + \|d-d_\infty\|_{H^1}^2). \tag{3.57}$$

Furthermore, we infer from (3.57) that for certain constants $C_3, C_4 > 0$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}y(t) + C_3 y(t) \leq C_4\|d-d_\infty\|^2 \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{2\theta}{1-2\theta}}. \tag{3.58}$$

As in [28,29], we have

$$y(t) \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{2\theta}{1-2\theta}}, \quad \forall\ t \geq 0, \tag{3.59}$$

which together with (3.57) implies that

$$\|v(t)\| + \|d(t)-d_\infty\|_{H^1} \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{\theta}{1-2\theta}}, \quad \forall\ t \geq 0. \tag{3.60}$$

Step 3. In the last step, we proceed prove the convergence rate in higher order norm. In Section 3.1, it has been proven that, once we could obtain the uniform bound of d in H^2, we are able to obtain strong convergence of d in H^2 instead of weak convergence. By reinvestigating the higher order energy estimate for the subtracted system (3.46)–(3.48) (cf. also Lemma 3.1), we can obtain a further result, which provides the same rate estimate of (v,d) in $H^1 \times H^2$ as (3.60).

In what follows, we just perform the estimates for classical solutions. Taking the time derivative of $A(t)$, we obtain by a direct calculation

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}A(t) + (\|Sv\|^2 + \|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d)\|^2)$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= (Sv, v\cdot\nabla v) - (f'(d)(\Delta d - f(d)), \Delta d - f(d)) + 2\int_\Omega (\Delta d - f(d))_{x_j} v^j_{x_k} d_{x_k} dx \\
&\quad - \int_\Omega \nabla\pi\cdot\nabla d(\Delta d - f(d))dx \\
&= (Sv, v\cdot\nabla v) - (f'(d)(\Delta d - f(d)), \Delta d - f(d)) \\
&\quad + 2\int_\Omega (\Delta d - f(d))_{x_j} v^j_{x_k}(d-d_\infty)_{x_k} dx - 2\int_\Omega (\Delta d - f(d))\nabla v\nabla^2 d_\infty dx \\
&\quad - \int_\Omega \nabla\pi\cdot\nabla d(\Delta d - f(d))dx \\
&:= I_2 + I_3 + I_4 + I_5 + I_6. \qquad (3.61)
\end{aligned}
$$

In the above, we use the fact that $(Sv, v_t) = (-\Delta v, v_t)$, which follows from $v_t \in H$. Noticing that we have got uniform bounds for $\|v\|_{H^1}$ and $\|d\|_{H^2}$ before (see Lemma 3.2), in what follows we estimate I_i $(i = 2, ..., 6)$ term by term.

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I_2| &\le \|Sv\|\|v\|_{L^4}\|\nabla v\|_{L^4} \le C\|Sv\|(\|\nabla v\|^{\frac12}\|v\|^{\frac12})(\|\Delta v\|^{\frac12}\|\nabla v\|^{\frac12}) \\
&\le C\|Sv\|\|\Delta v\|^{\frac12}\|v\|^{\frac12} \le \varepsilon_2\|Sv\|^2 + C\|v\|^2. \qquad (3.62)
\end{aligned}
$$

Since

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\|\nabla(\Delta d - \Delta d_\infty)\| \\
\le\ &\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\| + \|\nabla(f(d) - f(d_\infty))\| \\
\le\ &\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\| + \|f'(d)(\nabla d - \nabla d_\infty)\| + \|(f'(d) - f'(d_\infty))\nabla d_\infty\| \\
\le\ &\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\| + \|f'(d)\|_{L^\infty}\|(\nabla d - \nabla d_\infty)\| + \|f''(\xi)\|_{L^\infty}\|d - d_\infty\|_{L^4}\|\nabla d_\infty\|_{L^4} \\
\le\ &\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\| + C\|d - d_\infty\|_{H^1}, \qquad (3.63)
\end{aligned}
$$

we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I_3| &\le \|f'(d)\|_{L^\infty}\|\Delta d - f(d)\|^2 \le C(\|\Delta d - \Delta d_\infty\|^2 + \|f(d) - f(d_\infty)\|^2) \\
&\le C\|\Delta d - \Delta d_\infty\|^2 + C\|f'(\xi)\|^2_{L^\infty}\|d - d_\infty\|^2 \\
&\le C\|\nabla(\Delta d - \Delta d_\infty)\|^{\frac43}\|d - d_\infty\|^{\frac23} + C\|d - d_\infty\|^2 \\
&\le \varepsilon_2\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2 + C\|d - d_\infty\|^2. \qquad (3.64)
\end{aligned}
$$

Next,

$$
\begin{aligned}
|I_4| &\le \|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|\|\nabla v\|_{L^4}\|\nabla(d - d_\infty)\|_{L^4} \\
&\le \varepsilon_2\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2 \\
&\quad + C(\|\Delta v\|\|\nabla v\| + \|\nabla v\|^2)(\|\Delta(d - d_\infty)\|\|\nabla(d - d_\infty)\| + \|\nabla(d - d_\infty)\|^2) \\
&\le \varepsilon_2\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2 + \varepsilon_2\|Sv\|^2 + C\|\Delta(d - d_\infty)\|^2 + C\left(1 + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2}\right)\|\nabla(d - d_\infty)\|^2
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\leq \quad 2\varepsilon_2\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2 + \varepsilon_2\|Sv\|^2 + C\|d - d_\infty\|^2_{H^1}. \tag{3.65}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |I_5| &\leq \|\Delta d - f(d)\|_{L^4}\|\nabla v\|_{L^4}\|\nabla^2 d_\infty\| \\ &\leq C\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|(\|\Delta v\|^{\frac{3}{4}}\|v\|^{\frac{1}{4}} + \|v\|) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_2\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon_2}(\|\Delta v\|^{\frac{3}{2}}\|v\|^{\frac{1}{2}} + \|v\|^2) \\ &\leq \varepsilon_2\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2 + \varepsilon_2\|Sv\|^2 + C\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon_2^7} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon_2}\right)\|v\|^2. \end{aligned} \tag{3.66}$$

$$\begin{aligned} |I_6| &\leq \|\nabla\pi\|\|\nabla d\|_{L^4}\|\Delta d - f(d)\|_{L^4} \\ &\leq C\|Sv\|\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|\Delta d - f(d)\|^{\frac{1}{2}}\|d\|_{H^2} \\ &\leq \varepsilon_2\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2 + \varepsilon_2\|Sv\|^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon_2^3}\|\Delta d - f(d)\|^2 \\ &\leq 2\varepsilon_2\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2 + \varepsilon_2\|Sv\|^2 + \frac{C}{\varepsilon_2^7}\|d - d_\infty\|^2_{H^1}. \end{aligned} \tag{3.67}$$

Taking ε_2 sufficiently small, we deduce from (3.61)–(3.67) that

$$\frac{d}{dt}A(t) + (\|Sv\|^2 + \|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2) \leq C(\|v\|^2 + \|d - d_\infty\|^2_{H^1}). \tag{3.68}$$

Using the Poincaré inequality for $\Delta d - f(d)$ whose trace on Γ is 0 and Lemma 2.2, we can conclude from (3.68) and (3.60) that

$$\frac{d}{dt}A(t) + CA(t) \leq C(\|v\|^2 + \|d - d_\infty\|^2_{H^1}) \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{2\theta}{1-2\theta}}, \quad \forall\ t \geq 0. \tag{3.69}$$

Again, by the Gronwall inequality, we have

$$A(t) \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{2\theta}{1-2\theta}}, \quad \forall\ t \geq 0, \tag{3.70}$$

which yields

$$\|\nabla v(t)\| + \|\Delta d(t) - f(d(t))\| \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{\theta}{1-2\theta}}, \quad \forall\ t \geq 0. \tag{3.71}$$

Recalling (3.27), it follows from (3.71) that

$$\|\Delta d(t) - \Delta d_\infty\| \leq C(1+t)^{-\frac{\theta}{1-2\theta}}, \quad \forall\ t \geq 0. \tag{3.72}$$

Summing up, from (3.60)(3.71)(3.72) we can deduce the required estimate (1.13). The proof of Theorem 1.1 is complete.

4 Results for Three Dimensional Case

The results proved in previous section hold true for global classical solutions to system (1.1)–(1.5) in 3-D case. In what follows, we show the convergence to equilibrium for two subcases considered in [15] (ref. Theorem B and Theorem C therein) that existence of global classical solution was proven. In particular, we answer the question of uniqueness of asymptotic limit of d (cf. [15, Remark, page 32]) and provide a uniform convergence rate.

Case I: Initial Data Near Absolute Minimizer of E.
The following result has been proven in [15, Proposition 5.2].

Proposition 4.1. *There is an $\varepsilon_0 \in (0,1)$ depending only on $\nu, \lambda, \gamma, \Omega$ and f with the following property: Whenever*

$$\nu\|\nabla v\|^2(0) + \lambda\gamma\|\Delta d - f(d)\|^2(0) \le \varepsilon_0,$$

either
(1) Problem (1.1)–(1.5) has a unique classical solution (v,d) in $\Omega \times (0,+\infty)$
or
(2) there is a $T_* \in (0,+\infty)$ such that

$$E(T_*) < E(0) - \varepsilon_0,$$

where

$$E(t) = \|v\|^2 + \lambda\|\nabla d\|^2 + 2\lambda\int_\Omega F(d)dx.$$

Moreover, in case (1), one has

$$\|v(t)\|_{H^1(\Omega)} \to 0, \quad \|\Delta d - f(d)\| \to 0, \quad \text{as } t \to +\infty. \tag{4.1}$$

Before proving the convergence result corresponding to Theorem 1.1, we turn to the second case. Later we shall prove our result in a unified way.

Case II: Arbitrary Initial Data with Large Viscosity.

It has been proven that for any initial data $v_0 \in H^1(\Omega)$, $d_0 \in H^2(\Omega)$, if the viscosity ν is "large enough" (see below), problem (1.1)–(1.5) admits a unique global classical solution (cf. [15, Theorem B]). As pointed out in [15], when the dimension is three, the size of viscosity ν plays a rather crucial role while the other constants λ, γ do not, as long as λ, γ are positive constants. Thus we shall assume $\lambda = \gamma = 1$ for the sake of simplicity. The following high order energy estimate can be obtained (cf. [15, (4.13)]).

Lemma 4.1. *In the 3-D case, the following inequality holds for classical solution* (v, d) *to problem* (1.1)–(1.5)

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{A}(t) \le -\left(\nu - K\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{A}\right)\|\Delta v\|^2 - \left(1 - \frac{K\tilde{A}}{\nu}\right)\|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2 + K\tilde{A}, \quad \forall\, t \ge 0, \tag{4.2}$$

where $\tilde{A} = A + 1 = \|\nabla v\|^2 + \|\Delta d - f(d)\|^2 + 1$ *(cf.* (3.1)*) and* K *is a positive constant depending on* $f, \nu, \Omega, \|v_0\|, \|d_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}$.

When the viscosity ν is assumed to be properly large, based on the above lemma, we can not only show that the global solution (v, d) is uniformly bounded (as in [15]) but also the quantity $A(t)$ decays to zero in time.

It follows from (3.6) that

$$\int_t^{t+1} \tilde{A}(\tau)d\tau \le \int_t^{t+1} A(\tau)d\tau + 1 \le M, \quad \forall\, t \ge 0, \tag{4.3}$$

where $M > 0$ is a constant depending only on $\|v_0\|, \|d_0\|_{H^1}$. Then we have

Lemma 4.2. *If*

$$\nu^{\frac{1}{2}} \ge K\left(\tilde{A}(0) + 2KM + 4M\right) + \frac{1}{2}, \tag{4.4}$$

then the unique global solution to problem (1.1)–(1.5) *satisfies the following uniform estimate*

$$\|v(t)\|_{H^1} + \|d(t)\|_{H^2} \le C, \quad \forall\, t \ge 0, \tag{4.5}$$

where C *is a constant depending on* $f, \Omega, \|v_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \|d_0\|_{H^2(\Omega)}$. *Furthermore,*

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}(\|v(t)\|_{H^1} + \| - \Delta d(t) + f(d(t))\|) = 0. \tag{4.6}$$

Proof. Proof of existence and uniqueness of the global solution has been given in [15]. Next, we show the uniform bound (4.5). Take ν large enough that (4.4) is satisfied. Then by (4.2), there must be some $T_0 > 0$ such that

$$\nu - K\nu^{\frac{1}{2}}\tilde{A}(t) \ge 0, \quad 1 - \frac{K\tilde{A}(t)}{\nu} \ge 0,$$

for all $t \in [0, T_0]$. Moreover, on $[0, T_0]$,

$$\frac{d}{dt}\tilde{A}(t) \le 2K\tilde{A}(t). \tag{4.7}$$

Denote $T_* = \sup T_0$. First we show that $T_* \ge 1$ by a contradiction argument.
If $T_* < 1$, then

$$\tilde{A}(T_*) \le \tilde{A}(0) + 2K\int_0^1 \tilde{A}(t)dt \le \tilde{A}(0) + 2KM.$$

On the other hand, from the definition of T_*, we have

$$\nu < \max\{K\tilde{A}(T_*), K^2\tilde{A}^2(T_*)\} \leq K(\tilde{A}(0) + 2KM) + K^2(\tilde{A}(0) + 2KM)^2,$$

which contradict (4.4).

Next, if $T_* < +\infty$, (4.3) implies that there is a $t_1 \in [T_* - \frac{1}{2}, T_*]$ such that

$$\tilde{A}(t_1) \leq 4M. \tag{4.8}$$

As a result,

$$\tilde{A}(T_*) \leq 4M + 2K \int_{t_1}^{T_*} \tilde{A}(t)dt \leq 4M + 2KM. \tag{4.9}$$

Again from the definition of T_*, we have

$$\nu < \max\{K\tilde{A}(T_*), K^2\tilde{A}^2(T_*)\},$$

which together with (4.9) yields a contradiction with (4.4).

Therefore, for all $t \geq 0$, (4.7) holds. Namely,

$$\frac{d}{dt}A(t) \leq 2KA(t) + 2K \leq KA^2(t) + 3K. \tag{4.10}$$

Due to (3.6), we can conclude (4.5) and (4.6) following the similar argument in the proof of Lemma 3.2. □

Remark 4.1. *Generally speaking,* (4.4) *only provides a sufficient condition on the largeness of viscosity* ν*, which ensures the existence of global solution to problem* (1.1)–(1.5)*. It may not be an optimal lower bound for all possible* ν*.*

Based on above results, now for both cases I and II, one can argue exactly as in Section 3.1 to conclude

$$\lim_{t\to+\infty}(\|v(t)\|_{H^1} + \|d(t) - d_\infty\|_{H^2}) = 0. \tag{4.11}$$

Then we are able to proceed to show the estimate on convergence rate for both two cases. To this aim, we check the argument for 2-D case step by step. By applying corresponding Sobolev embedding Theorems in 3-D, we can see that all calculations in Section 3.2 are valid for our current case (with minor modifications). Hence the details are omitted.

We complete the proof for Theorem 1.2 and Theorem 1.3.

5 Further Remarks

We remark that our approach used in this paper are valid for some other model systems for nematic liquid crystal flows in the literature and similar convergence result can be proved.

(1) **A model with changing density**

Recently the following problem was considered in [20].

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_t + \nabla \cdot (\rho v) &= 0, \quad \rho \geq 0, && (5.1)\\ (\rho v)_t + \nabla \cdot (\rho v \odot v) - \nu \Delta v + \nabla P &= -\lambda \nabla \cdot (\nabla d \odot \nabla d), && (5.2)\\ \nabla \cdot v &= 0, && (5.3)\\ d_t + v \cdot \nabla d &= \gamma(\Delta d - f(d)), && (5.4) \end{aligned}$$

in $\Omega \times (0, \infty)$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n (n = 2, 3)$ is a bounded domain with smooth boundary Γ. $\rho(x, t)$ is a scalar function denoting the density of the fluid. The above density-dependent liquid crystal model is subject to the following initial condition

$$\rho|_{t=0} = \rho_0(x) \geq 0, \quad (\rho v)|_{t=0} = q_0(x), \quad d|_{t=0} = d_0(x), \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \tag{5.5}$$

and the boundary conditions:

$$v(x, t) = 0, \quad d(x, t) = d_0(x), \qquad \text{for } (x, t) \in \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}^+. \tag{5.6}$$

Problem (5.1)–(5.6) can be viewed as a generalization of our problem (1.1)–(1.5). It enjoys some important properties as for (1.1)–(1.5). In particular, we have the following *basic energy law* (see [20])

$$\frac{d}{dt} \int_\Omega \left(\frac{1}{2} \rho |v|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} |\nabla d|^2 + \frac{\lambda}{2} \int_\Omega F(d) dx \right) = - \int_\Omega \left(\nu |\nabla v|^2 + \lambda \gamma |\Delta d - f(d)|^2 \right) dx. \tag{5.7}$$

In [20], the authors proved the existence of the weak solution to incompressible liquid crystal system (5.1)–(5.6) under certain compatibility condition on the initial data. There they considered the general case for the density, namely they only required the initial density to be nonnegative. As a result, one can only expect the density to be nonnegative for all time and vacuum state may occur. In this case, it is very difficult to prove corresponding results to [15, Theorem B, Theorem C] where the global existence and uniqueness as well as asymptotic behavior of classical solutions were obtained.

However, if we assume in addition that the initial density is a bounded positive function, i.e., there are two positive constants $\underline{\rho}$ and $\bar{\rho}$ such that

$$0 < \underline{\rho} \leq \rho_0(x) \leq \bar{\rho}, \quad \forall\ x \in \Omega. \tag{5.8}$$

Then by virtue of the comparison principle (cf. [20]), we have

$$0 < \underline{\rho} \le \rho(x,t) \le \bar{\rho}, \quad \forall\ t \ge 0. \tag{5.9}$$

In this special case, we can check that under suitable assumptions on the initial data (for instance, $v_0 \in H_0^1$, $d_0 \in H^2$), parallel results to [15, Theorem B, Theorem C] can be achieved. Besides the basic energy law (5.7), due to uniform upper and lower bound (5.9), one can proceed to get proper high order energy law similar to Lemma 3.1 (2-D case) as well as Lemma 4.1 (3-D case). For instance, denote

$$\hat{A}(t) = \rho\|\nabla v\|^2 + \lambda\|\Delta d - f(d)\|^2, \tag{5.10}$$

we can show that

Lemma 5.1. *In the 2-D case, the following inequality holds for the classical solution* (v,d) *to problem* (5.1)–(5.6)

$$\frac{d}{dt}\hat{A}(t) + K_1(\|Sv\|^2 + \|\nabla(\Delta d - f(d))\|^2) \le K_2(\hat{A}^2(t)+1), \qquad \forall t \ge 0, \tag{5.11}$$

where K_1, K_2 *are constants depending on* $f, \Omega, \|v_0\|, \|d_0\|_{H^1(\Omega)}, \nu, \lambda, \gamma, \bar{\rho}, \underline{\rho}$.

Corresponding results in 3-D case (cf. Lemma 4.1) can also be obtained. The proofs for these results follow from the same sprit of those in [15] with some proper modifications. Hence, the details are omitted here.

Remark 5.1. *Different from system* (1.1)–(1.5)*, where the density is assumed to be a constant, in order to get the high order energy law, we deal with the time derivative of a modified quantity* $\hat{A}(t)$ *with weight* ρ *instead of* $A(t)$*. This is due to the mathematical structure of* (5.1)–(5.6)*, in which the density variable is involved. Because of the uniform upper and lower bounds of the density* (5.9)*, one can check that* $\hat{A}(t)$ *plays a similar role as* $A(t)$ *for system* (1.1)–(1.5).

Based on the facts obtained above, we are able to prove the corresponding convergence results (cf. Theorem 1.1–Theorem 1.3) for system (5.1)–(5.6), following the argument in the previous sections. We leave the details to the interested readers.

(2) **A model with free-slip boundary condition**

$$v_t + v\cdot\nabla v - \nu\mathtt{div}D(v) + \nabla P = -\lambda\nabla\cdot(\nabla d \odot \nabla d), \tag{5.12}$$

$$\nabla\cdot v = 0, \tag{5.13}$$

$$d_t + v\cdot\nabla d = \gamma(\Delta d - f(d)), \tag{5.14}$$

in $\Omega \times (0,\infty)$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n (n = 2, 3)$ is a bounded polygonal domain (with piecewise smooth boundary). $D(v) = \frac{1}{2}(\nabla v + (\nabla v)^T)$ is the stretching tensor. We consider the system (5.12)–(5.14) subject to the initial conditions

$$v|_{t=0} = v_0(x) \ \text{ with } \nabla \cdot v_0 = 0, \quad d|_{t=0} = d_0(x), \qquad \text{for } x \in \Omega, \tag{5.15}$$

and the free-slip boundary conditions:

$$v \cdot \mathbf{n} = 0, \quad (\nabla \times v) \times \mathbf{n} = 0, \quad \partial_{\mathbf{n}} d = 0, \qquad \text{for } (x,t) \in \Gamma \times \mathbb{R}^+, \tag{5.16}$$

where $\mathbf{n}$ is the unit outer normal vector to the boundary Γ.

As has been pointed out in the recent paper [18], the free-slip boundary condition (5.16) indicates that in the liquid crystal flows, there is no contribution from the director field d to the surface forces. Boundary condition (5.16) seems to be more appropriate for some types of flow in the bulk of a liquid crystal configuration. On the other hand, it allows people to construct more efficient numerical schemes for the numerical simulations for liquid crystal flows (cf. [18]). Comparing with system (1.1)–(1.5), the influences of the corner singularities is less severe with free-slip and Neumann boundary conditions than the Dirichlet boundary conditions.

Basic theoretical analysis on problem (5.12)–(5.16) has been done in [18], where the authors proved global existences of weak solutions as well as regularities and global existence/uniqueness of classical solutions. In particular, although the boundary condition (5.16) plays a significantly different role in the calculation, proper high order energy law similar to Lemma 3.1 could still be obtained (cf. [18, Lemma 4.1]). The same convergence results for system (1.1)–(1.5) obtained in the present paper can be shown true for problem (5.12)–(5.16), by adapting the argument here. We thus omit the details.

Acknowledgement. A part of this paper was written during H. Wu's visit to the Department of Mathematics in Penn State University. The hospitality of Prof. C. Liu and the department is gratefully acknowledged. The research of H. Wu was partially supported by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation.

References

[1] P.G. de Gennes, *The Physics of Liquid Crystals*, Oxford, 1974.

[2] J. Ericksen, *Conservation laws for liquid crystals*, Trans. Soc. Rheol., **5**, 22–34, 1961.

[3] L.C. Evans, *Partial Differential Equations*, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, **19**, AMS, 1998.

[4] E. Feireisl and P. Takáč, *Long-time stabilization of solutions to the Ginzburg-Landau equations of superconductivity*, Monatsh. Math., **133**, 197–221, 2001.

[5] M. Grasselli, H. Wu and S. Zheng, *Asymptotic behavior of a non-isothermal Ginzburg-Landau model*, Quart. Appl. Math., **66**(4), 743–770, 2008.

[6] M. Grasselli, H. Wu and S. Zheng, *Convergence to equilibrium for parabolic-hyperbolic time-dependent Ginzburg-Landau-Maxwell equations*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **40**(5), 2007–2033, 2009.

[7] A. Haraux, *Systèmes Dynamiques Dissipatifs et Applications*, Masson, Paris, 1991.

[8] A. Haraux and M.A. Jendoubi, *Convergence of bounded weak solutions of the wave equation with dissipation and analytic nonlinearity*, Calc. Var. Partial Differential Equations., **9**, 95–124, 1999.

[9] A. Haraux and M.A. Jendoubi, *Decay estimates to equilibrium for some evolution equations with an analytic nonlinearity*, Asymptot. Anal., **26**, 21–36, 2001.

[10] S.-Z. Huang, *Gradient Inequalities, with Applications to Asymptotic Behavior and Stability of Gradient-Like Systems*, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, **126**, AMS, 2006.

[11] M.A. Jendoubi, *A simple unified approach to some convergence theorem of L. Simon*, J. Func. Anal., **153**, 187–202, 1998.

[12] F.M. Leslie, *Theory of flow phenomena in liquid crystals*, in Advances in Liquid Crystals, **4**, 1–81, G. Brown ed., Academic Press, New York, 1979.

[13] F.-H. Lin, *Nonlinear theory of defects in nematic liquid crystals: Phase transitions and flow phenomena*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math, **XLII** , 789–814, 1989.

[14] F.-H. Lin and Q. Du, *Ginzburg–Landau vortices: dynamics, pinning, and hysteresis*, SIAM J. Math. Anal., **28** , 1265–1293, 1997.

[15] F.-H. Lin and C. Liu, *Nonparabolic dissipative system modeling the flow of luquid crystals*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **XLVIII**, 501–537, 1995.

[16] F.-H. Lin and C. Liu, *Partial regularities of the nonlinear dissipative systems modeling the flow of liquid crystals*, Disc. Conti. Dyn. Sys. A, **2**, 1–23, 1996.

[17] C. Liu and N. J. Walkington, *Approximation of liquid crystal flows*, SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis, **37**, 725–741, 2000.

[18] C. Liu and J. Shen, *On liquid crystal flows with free–slip boundary conditions*, Disc. Conti. Dyn. Sys., **7**, 307–318, 2001.

[19] C. Liu and N. J. Walkington, *Mixed methods for the approximation of liquid crystal flows*, Math. Model. Numer. Anal., **36**(2), 205–222, 2002.

[20] X.-G. Liu and Z. Zhang, *Existence of the flow of liquid crystals system*, preprint 2008.

[21] S. Łojasiewicz, *Une propriété topologique des sous-ensembles analytiques réels*, Colloque Internationaux du C.N.R.S., **117**, Les équations aux dérivées partielles, 87–89, 1963.

[22] S. Łojasiewicz, *Ensembles Semi-analytiques*, Bures-sur-Yvette: I.H.E.S., 1965.

[23] L. Simon, *Asymptotics for a class of nonlinear evolution equation with applicationa to geometric problems*, Ann. of Math., **118**, 525–571, 1983

[24] H. Sun and C. Liu, *On energetic variational approaches in modeling the nematic liquid crystal flows*, Disc. Conti. Dyna. Sys., **23**(1&2), 455–475, 2009.

[25] R. Temam, *Navier–Stokes Equations*, Studies in Mathematics and its Applications **2**, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1977.

[26] R. Temam, *Navier–Stokes Equations and Nonlinear Functional Analysis*, SIAM 1983.

[27] H. Wu and S. Zheng, *Convergence to equilibrium for the Cahn-Hilliard equation with dynamic boundary conditions*, J. Differential Equations, **204**, 511–531, 2004.

[28] H. Wu, *Convergence to equilibrium for a Cahn-Hilliard model with the Wentzell boundary condition*, Asymptot. Anal., **54**, 71–92, 2007.

[29] H. Wu, M. Grasselli and S. Zheng, *Convergence to equilibrium for a parabolic–hyperbolic phase–field system with Neumann boundary conditions*, Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci., **17**, 1–29, 2007.

[30] S. Zheng, *Nonlinear Evolution Equations*, Pitman series Monographs and Survey in Pure and Applied Mathematics, **133**, Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, Florida, 2004.